DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 120 222 TM 005 181

AUTHOR Alvir, Howard P.
TITLE The Evolution of an Evaluation Form.
PUB DATE 5 Jan 76
NOTE 56p.; For related document, see TM 005 183; Occasional light print
AVAILABLE FROM Howard P. Alvir, 27 Norwood Street, Albany, New York 12203 (For loan copy send stamped self-addressed envelope)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS *Evaluation; *Evaluation Methods; Guidelines; Inservice Teacher Education; Models; Questionnaires; Scoring; *Teacher Workshops; Test Construction

ABSTRACT

This document enables the would be evaluator to witness the evolution of an evaluation form through successive stages of development. Each stage of development is documented by examples and explanations. The subjects of the discussion are: participants' evaluation of inservice teacher workshops, observers' evaluation of participants at the workshop, and tabulating workshop evaluation forms. (Author/RC)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED120222

JM

TITLE:

THE EVOLUTION OF AN EVALUATION FORM

AUTHOR:

Howard P. Alvir, Ph.D.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

DATE:

January 5, 1976

TM005 181

This document has no institutional sponsorship.

for a LOAN COPY

Send a stamped self-addressed envelope to

Howard P. ALVIR, Ph.D.
27 Norwood Street
Albany, New York 12203

Or phone 518--438-5787 (Sorry, no collect calls.)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
PARTICIPANTS' EVALUATION OF INSERVICE TEACHER WORKSHOPS	2
Critical Analysis of First Rough Draft	5
Form I	9
Potential Application Guide	11
OBSERVERS' EVALUATION OF PARTICIPANTS AT THE WORKSHOP	20
Tally Directions	29
Potential Application Guide	32
Inservice Evaluation System (Baseline Date)	40
TABULATING WORKSHOP EVALUATION FORMS (PRE-COUNT ANALYSIS)	42
Pre-tallying Inspection of Evaluation Forms	43
General Introduction to Packets 1 and 2 (Summer 75 Version)	44
Data Table	49
Evaluation Report	51
Evaluation Materials	52

INTRODUCTION

This document enables the would be evaluator to witness the evolution of an evaluation form through successive stages of development.

Each stage of development is documented by examples and explanations.

PARTICIPANTS' EVALUATION OF INSERVICE TEACHER WORKSHOPS

DIRECTIONS: Circle "yes" or "no" for each of the following. (Comments may be added on the reverse side of this paper. If comments are added, please identify each comment with the corresponding question number).

YES NO 1. The workshop topics were of practical value.

YES NO 2. The workshop helped participants identify needs not previously identified.

YES NO 3. Presentations were well organized.

YES NO 4. Use of media was well integrated.

YES NO 5. Program schedule was maintained.

YES NO 6. Sessions offered simulating or new material.

YES NO 7. Audience questions were well answered.

YES NO 8. Meeting rooms were adequate.

YES NO 9. This type of workshop should be held again next year.

YES NO 10. This workshop has some implications for the way I teach.

YES NO 11. I hope that some of the activities or presentations made in this workshop will be used again.

YES NO 12. I would recommend that my colleagues attend this workshop the next time it is given.

YES NO 13. Most of what was covered in this workshop was previously known by me.

YES NO 14. I am at a loss to describe how this workshop can help me become a better teacher.

YES NO 15. I am at a loss in trying to determine how some of this workshop can help my students once I return to the classroom.

YES NO 16. I was made aware of the objectives of the workshop before I came to the workshop.

YES NO 17. I was made aware of the workshop's objectives only after I came to the workshop.

YES NO 18. The workshop activities were appropriate for meeting the stated objectives.

YES NO 19. Reasonable progress was made towards meeting the objectives of the workshop.

YES NO 20. Instructional resources were appropriate and adequate for achievement of workshop objectives.

YES NO 21. Resources, personnel, and materials were appropriate for the workshop objectives.

YES NO 22. Workshop personnel exhibited the qualities essential to the success of the workshop. (Consider open-mindedness, creativity, specialized knowlede, administrative ability, communication skills, and the like.)

YES NO 23. There was evidence of good administrative practice in leadership at this workshop.

YES NO 24. There was evidence of good administrative practice in supervision at this workshop.

YES NO 25. There was evidence of good administrative practice in physical management.

YES NO 26. The workshop content was practical and useful in helping improve classroom instruction.

YES NO 27. A process was built into this workshop to encourage and facilitate classroom applications.

YES NO 28. Each workshop participant had a chance to provide feedback to the workshop staff.

YES NO 29. The physical environment was adequate as far as lighting, ventilation, parking, cafeteria, learning facilities, and other such things are concerned.

YES NO 30. This workshop had some outstanding components which were unique or innovative.

YES NO 31. This workshop was an overall successful training experience.

PARTICIPANTS' EVALUATION OF
INSERVICE WORKSHOPS

CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF FIRST ROUGH DRAFT

After rereading the first rough draft, the following analysis was made.

Certain items were put in the OBJ column because they refer to workshop objectives.

Certain items were put in the RES column because they refer to workshop resources.

Certain items were put in the EVAL column because they refer to workshop evaluation processes.

OBJ	RES	EVAL
1	3	19
30	4	22
13	5	23
16	6	24
17	7	25
26	8	29
27	18	28
14	20	2
15	21	10
		11
		9
		12
		31

2nd
~~1st~~ Rough Draft

PARTICIPANTS' EVALUATION OF INSERVICE TEACHER WORKSHOPS

DIRECTIONS: Circle "yes" or "no" for each of the following. (Comments may be added on the reverse side of this paper. If comments are added, please identify each comment with the corresponding question number).

YES NO 1. The workshop topics were of practical value.

YES NO 2. 30. This workshop had some outstanding components which were unique or innovative.

YES NO 3. 13. Most of what was covered in this workshop was previously known by me.

YES NO 4. 16. I was made aware of the objectives of the workshop before I came to the workshop.

YES NO 5. 17. I was made aware of the workshop's objectives only after I came to the workshop.

YES NO 6. 26. The workshop content was practical and useful in helping improve classroom instruction.

YES NO 7. 27. A process was built into this workshop to encourage and facilitate classroom applications.

YES NO 8. 14. I am at a loss to describe how this workshop can help me become a better teacher.

YES NO 9. 15. I am at a loss in trying to determine how some of this workshop can help my students once I return to the classroom.

YES NO 10. 3. Presentations were well organized.

YES NO 11. 4. Use of media was well integrated.

YES NO 12 5. Program schedule was maintained.

YES NO 13 6. Sessions offered simulating or new material.

YES NO 14 7. Audience questions were well answered.

YES NO 15 8. Meeting rooms were adequate.

YES NO 16 18. The workshop activities were app. or e for meeting the stated objectives.

YES NO 17 20. Instructional resources were appropriate and adequate for achievement of workshop objectives.

YES NO 18 21. Resources, personnel, and materials were appropriate for the workshop objectives.

YES NO 19 19. Reasonable progress was made towards meeting the objectives of the workshop.

YES NO 20 22. Workshop personnel exhibit the qualities essential to the success of the workshop. (Consider open-mindedness, creativity, specialized knowlede, administrative ability, communication skills, and the like.)

YES NO 21 23. There was evidence of good administrative practice in leadership.

YES NO 22 24. There was evidence of good administrative practice in supervision.

YES NO 23 25. There was evidence of good administrative practice in physical management.

YES NO 24 29. The physical environment was adequate as far as lighting, ventilation, parking, cafeteria, learning facilities, and other such things are concerned.

YES NO 25 28. Each workshop participant had a chance to provide feedback to the workshop staff.

YES NO 26 2. The workshop helped participants identify needs not previously identified.

YES NO 27 10. This workshop has some implications for the way I teach.

YES NO 29 11. I hope that some of the activities or presentations made in this workshop will be used again.

YES NO 29 9. This type of workshop should be held again next year.

YES NO 30 12. I would recommend that my colleagues attend this workshop the next time it is given.

YES NO 31 31. This workshop was an overall successful training experience.

ID # = ____

OFFICE USE ONLY

ON = ____

RA = ____

PA = ____

GT = ____

FORM I

PARTICIPANTS' EVALUATION OF INSERVICE TEACHER WORKSHOPS

DIRECTIONS: I. Identify the workshop and the dates of attendance.

Workshop: _____

Dates: _____

II. Circle YES or NO for each of the following. Comments may be added. Questions left blank, undecided, or answered with both YES and NO will automatically be tabulated as NO unless explained with a comment.

1.	I was made aware of the workshop objectives before I came to the workshop.	1. YES	NO
2.	The workshop objectives were clearly stated.	2. YES	NO
3.	The workshop objectives were related to my teaching concerns as an occupational educator.	3. YES	NO
4.	Most of this workshop centered around material that was interesting, challenging, and usable.	4. YES	NO
5.	The purpose and objectives of this workshop made sense to me.	5. YES	NO
6.	The workshop objectives were met to a high degree.	6. YES	NO
7.	This workshop should be held again with the same objectives for those of my colleagues who were unable to attend.	7. YES	NO
8.	This workshop should be held again for the same participants on a more advanced level.	8. YES	NO
9.	This workshop had some components which were unique or innovative.	9. YES	NO
10.	Most of the scheduled workshop activities made good use of the time available.	10. YES	NO

11.	Most presentations were well organized.	11.	YES NO
12.	Most workshop personnel (speakers, presenters, and resource persons) provided the kind of information, expertise, creativity, and communication skills expected by me as a participant.	12.	YES NO
13.	Most sessions offered stimulating or new material.	13.	YES NO
14.	My questions were dealt with satisfactorily.	14.	YES NO
15.	The workshop activities were appropriate for meeting the stated objectives.	15.	YES NO
16.	Instructional resources were appropriate and adequate for achievement of workshop objectives.	16.	YES NO
17.	There was evidence of good administrative practice in leadership and supervision on the part of the workshop director.	17.	YES NO
18.	Meeting room facilities were suitable.	18.	YES NO
19.	The physical environment was adequate as far as lodging, lighting, ventilation, parking, cafeteria, and other such things were concerned.	19.	YES NO
20.	This workshop was a successful training experience for me.	20.	YES NO
21.	The workshop content was practical and useful in helping improve classroom instruction.	21.	YES NO
22.	Reasonable progress was made by me individually towards meeting the objectives of the workshop.	22.	YES NO
23.	I had a chance to provide feedback to the workshop staff.	23.	YES NO
24.	I had a chance to identify professional needs which I previously had ignored.	24.	YES NO
25.	This workshop has some implications for the way I teach.	25.	YES NO
26.	The things I learned at this workshop will help the students I teach this coming year.	26.	YES NO
27.	Overall, this workshop was a worthwhile and valuable experience.	27.	YES NO
28.	I am able to list specific benefits I received at this workshop.	28.	YES NO

FORM I

PARTICIPANTS EVALUATION OF TEACHER INSERVICE WORKSHOPS

Potential Application Guide

Purpose

The purpose of this guide is to show typical workshop recommendations that can be given any time a specific evaluation item is responded to unfavorably by evaluators.

The left hand column entitled EVALUATION ITEM is paralleled by the right hand column entitled APPROPRIATE REACTION TO NEGATIVE EVALUATION.

The digits preceding the hyphen in the following examples help link appropriate activities to the correlated evaluation items. Thus, reactions 1-1, 1-2, 1-3, and so forth are related to evaluation item 1-0.

EVALUATION ITEM	APPROPRIATE REACTION TO NEGATIVE EVALUATION
1-0 I was made aware of the workshop objectives before I came to the workshop.	1-1 List the workshop objectives in writing. 1-2 Examine the workshop objectives to make sure that each objective is clear, specific, and operational. 1-3 Restate the workshop objectives in terms of teacher competencies. 1-4 Restate the workshop objectives in terms of learner benefits (where learners refer to students taught by participating workshop attendees). 1-5 Specify how the workshop objectives are to be communicated to workshop participants well in advance of the workshop.
2-0 The workshop objectives were clearly stated.	2-1 Reexamine workshop objectives to find any that could possibly cause misunderstanding. 2-2 Ask an outside judge to rank the objectives in order of clarity. 2-3 Rewrite those objectives which were given the lowest rank as far as clarity is concerned. 2-4 Correlate each workshop objective with a photograph that shows the successful workshop participant applying this objective in the classroom. 2-5 Repeat the preceding procedures by having an independent judge examine the workshop objectives for operational specificity.

EVALUATION ITEM	APPROPRIATE REACTION TO NEGATIVE EVALUATION
3-0 The workshop objectives were related to my teaching concerns as an occupational educator.	3-1 List the top priority teaching concerns of an occupational educator in the opinion of the workshop director. 3-2 List the top priority teaching concerns of an occupational educator in the opinion of the workshop staff. 3-3 List the top priority teaching concerns of an occupational educator in the opinion of the teacher participants. 3-4 Compare the various priorities of the preceding lists of teaching concerns. 3-5 Try to explain why certain of the workshop objectives were view differently on each of the preceding three lists.
4-0 Most of this workshop centered around material that was interesting, challenging, and usable.	4-1 Identify the most interesting material at the workshop. 4-2 Identify the most challenging material at the workshop. 4-3 Identify the most usable material at the workshop. 4-4 Answer the preceding questions from the viewpoint of participating teachers. 4-5 Eliminate workshop material that was neither interesting, nor challenging, nor usable.
5-0 The purpose and objectives of this workshop made sense to me.	5-1 Explain simply the most important objective of the workshop. 5-2 Explain briefly why this objective is so important. 5-3 Explain how this objective can make participating teachers better educators. 5-4 Explain how this objective can bring immediate benefit to learners taught by participating teachers. 5-5 Explain why this important objective could not have been accomplished just as effectively in a memo.
6-0 The workshop objectives were met to a high degree.	6-1 Identify the workshop objectives that were accomplished to the highest degree. 6-2 Explain the criteria used to identify the most highly accomplished workshop objectives. 6-3 Identify the workshop objective that was met to the lowest degree in comparison with the others. 6-4 Identify the workshop objective that was met to the highest degree in comparison with the others. 6-5 Specify what still remains undone after the workshop as far as objectives are concerned.

EVALUATION ITEM	APPROPRIATE REACTION TO NEGATIVE EVALUATION
7-0 This workshop should be held again with the same objectives for those of my colleagues who were unable to attend.	7-1 Explain why participants do not feel the workshop should be repeated with the same objectives. 7-2 Identify those objectives that should be changed if the workshop is to be repeated. 7-3 Contrast the number of participant teachers who attended with the potential number of teachers who could have attended the workshop. 7-4 Explain your reasons why the workshop should or should not be repeated again with the same objectives. 7-5 Pinpoint components of the workshop that should be repeated or at least made available in a different format.
8-0 This workshop should be held again for the same participants on a more advanced level.	8-1 Identify the reasons why some participants felt that the workshop should not be held again for the same participants on a more advanced level. 8-2 List characteristics of participants who should attend the workshop if it is to be repeated again. 8-3 Identify the level on which the workshop should be offered if it is to be repeated again. 8-4 Identify changes that should be made if the workshop is to be repeated again. 8-5 Identify contributions that this workshop has made that do not need to be repeated.
9-0 This workshop had some components which were unique or innovative.	9-1 List workshop components which were unique. 9-2 List workshop components which were innovative. 9-3 Identify the criteria which were used to label components as either unique or innovative. 9-4 Specify the workshop component which should have been recognized by participants as being the most unique. 9-5 Specify the workshop component which should have been recognized by participants as being the most innovative.

EVALUATION ITEM	APPROPRIATE REACTION TO NEGATIVE EVALUATION
10-0 Most of the scheduled workshop activities made good use of the time available.	10-1 Analyze the workshop agenda in order to pinpoint lost time. 10-2 List possible alternative activities that would have used the time better. 10-3 Name the one scheduled workshop activity that seemed to have made best use of the time available. 10-4 Earmark those activities that could have been sacrificed if the time had been shorter. 10-5 Identify the criteria used to determine whether or not a good use had been made of the time available.
11-0 Most presentations were well organized.	11-1 Identify the three presentations that were the most well organized. 11-2 Analyze these well organized presentations in order to find elements that can be imitated by others. 11-3 Identify speakers and presenters that could be used again with the same topic. 11-4 Identify speakers and presenters that could be used again with different topics. 11-5 Determine whether or not the well organized presentations were identifiable before the presentations were made.
12-0 Most workshop personnel (speakers, presenters, and resource persons) provided the kind of information, expertise, creativity, and communication skills expected by me as a participant.	12-1 Itemize the kind of information expected by participants. 12-2 Itemize the kind of expertise expected by participants. 12-3 Itemize the kind of creativity expected by participants. 12-4 Itemize the kind of communication skills expected by participants. 12-5 Specify how participant expectations were analyzed before the workshop.
13-0 Most sessions offered stimulating or new material.	13-1 Define what is meant by stimulating material. 13-2 Define what is meant by new material. 13-3 Pinpoint the session that was most interesting or most new. 13-4 Plan how to reinforce sessions that provide stimulating or new material. 13-5 Identify a number of ways in which stimulating or new material contributed to the accomplishment of the workshop objectives.

EVALUATION ITEM	APPROPRIATE REACTION TO NEGATIVE EVALUATION
14-0 My questions were dealt with satisfactorily.	14-1 List all the questions that were asked by participants during the entire workshop. 14-2 List those questions that were satisfactorily answered. 14-3 List those questions that were unsatisfactorily answered. 14-4 Brainstorm a number of ways to handle questions that were not answered during the workshop. 14-5 Brainstorm a number of questions that participants should have asked but weren't asked.
15-0 The workshop activities were appropriate for meeting the stated objectives.	15-1 List the stated objectives. 15-2 Correlate with each stated objective appropriate workshop activities. 15-3 List workshop activities that took place but that did not seem correlated with the stated objectives. 15-4 Identify those individuals responsible for selecting workshop activities. 15-5 Identify another list of people who should be consulted for the selection of workshop activities if the workshop is repeated.
16-0 Instructional resources were appropriate and adequate for achievement of workshop objectives.	16-1 Explain what is meant by an appropriate instructional resource. 16-2 Explain what is meant by an adequate instructional resource. 16-3 Give some examples of how instructional resources should be appropriate and adequate for achievement of workshop objectives. 16-4 Identify achievement criteria for each workshop objective. 16-5 Identify the instructional resource that was recognized as most appropriate for achievement of workshop objectives. 16-6 Identify those workshop objectives that could have been achieved independently with the help of instructional resources without the need for a full length workshop.

EVALUATION ITEM	APPROPRIATE REACTION TO NEGATIVE EVALUATION
17-0 There was evidence of good administrative in leadership and supervision on the part of the workshop director.	17-1 Give the workshop director's definition of good administrative practice. 17-2 Give the workshop director's definition of leadership. 17-3 Give the workshop director's definition of supervision. 17-4 Explain how these definitions agree with or disagree with the definitions help by participants. 17-5 Document how in practice the operational definition of the workshop director were accepted by participants.
18-0 Meeting room facilities were suitable.	18-1 List the meeting room facilities. 18-2 List the criteria utilized by the workshop director to determine suitability of meeting room facilities. 18-3 Rank each meeting room facility by first, second, and so forth on the basis of the specified criteria. 18-4 Explain any physical inability to provide completely suitable meeting room facilities. 18-5 Analyze the reactions, both positive and negative, of participants to meeting room facilities.
19-0 The physical environment was adequate as far as lodging, lighting, ventilation, parking, cafeteria, and other things were concerned.	19-1 Explain why the workshop director feels that the lodgings were adequate or inadequate. 19-2 Explain why the workshop director feels that the lighting was adequate or inadequate. 19-3 Explain why the workshop director feels that the ventilation was adequate or inadequate. 19-4 Explain why the workshop director feels that the parking was adequate or inadquate. 19-5 Explain why the workshop director feels that the cafeteria was adequate or inadequate.

EVALUATION ITEM	APPROPRIATE REACTION TO NEGATIVE EVALUATION
20-0 This workshop was a successful training experience for me.	20-1 Define a successful training experience. 20-2 Distinguish between a successful training experience and an unsuccessful training experience. 20-3 Explain why the workshop director feels that the training experience was either successful or unsuccessful. 20-4 List things beyond the control of the workshop director that cannot be improved if the workshop is to be recycled. 20-5 List things within the control of the workshop director to be improved if the workshop is to be recycled.
21-0 The workshop content was practical and useful in helping improve classroom instruction.	21-1 Define what is meant by practical workshop content. 21-2 Define what is meant by useful workshop content. 21-3 Specify the criteria used to determine practical content. 21-4 Specify the criteria used to determine useful content. 21-5 Present the viewpoint of the workshop director as far as the practicality and usefulness of the workshop content are concerned.
22-0 Reasonable progress was made by me individually towards meeting the objectives of the workshop.	22-1 Explain the workshop director's definition of reasonable progress. 22-2 Explain the participants perception of reasonable progress. 22-3 Explain how the workshop director's definition correlated with the participants perception of reasonable progress. 22-4 Specify how much provision was made to accomodate differences in individual progress rates. 22-5 Point out how a range of challenges was provided for fast and slow learners.

EVALUATION ITEM	APPROPRIATE REACTION TO NEGATIVE EVALUATION
23-0 I had a chance to provide feedback to the workshop staff.	23-1 Specify the feedback received by the workshop director. 23-2 Specify the feedback received by the workshop staff. 23-3 Describe the type of rapport existing between workshop staff and participants. 23-4 Identify the positive results of this feedback. 23-5 List the opportunities provided in the agenda and program for formal and informal feedback.
24-0 I had a chance to identify professional needs which I previously had ignored.	24-1 List professional needs called to the attention of participants by the workshop director. 24-2 List professional needs called to the attention of participants by the workshop staff. 24-3 List professional needs called to the attention of participants by fellow participants. 24-4 Try to cluster the professional needs discussed. 24-5 Rank the professional needs discussed by priority.
25-0 This workshop has some implications for the way I teach.	25-1 Identify teaching implications specified by the workshop director. 25-2 Identify teaching implications specified by the workshop staff. 25-3 Identify teaching implications specified by the workshop participants to one another. 25-4 Try to cluster these teaching implications. 25-5 Rank these teaching implications.

EVALUATION ITEM	APPROPRIATE REACTION TO NEGATIVE EVALUATION
26-0 The things I learned at this workshop will help the students I teach this coming year.	26-1 List specific things teachers felt will have a direct impact upon students 26-2 List specific things the workshop director felt will have direct impact upon the workshop staff. 26-3 Try to cluster these direct influences upon students. 26-4 Rank these direct influences upon students.
27-0 Overall, this workshop was a worthwhile and valuable experience.	27-1 Identify what the workshop director felt was the most worthwhile and valuable experience. 27-2 Identify what the workshop staff felt was the most worthwhile and valuable experience. 27-3 Identify what the workshop participants felt was the most worthwhile and valuable experience. 27-4 Try to cluster these worthwhile and valuable experiences identified in the preceding items. 27-5 Try to rank these worthwhile and valuable experiences identified in the preceding items.
28-0 I am able to list specific benefits I received at this workshop.	28-1 Note specific benefits listed by the workshop director. 28-2 Note specific benefits listed by the workshop staff. 28-3 Note specific benefits listed by the workshop participants. 28-4 Try to cluster the specific benefits received at the workshop. 28-5 Rank the specific benefits received at the workshop.

OBSERVERS' EVALUATION OF PARTICIPANTS AT THE WORKSHOP

DIRECTIONS: Circle "yes" or "no" for each of the following. (Comments may be added on the reverse side of this paper. If comments are added, please identify each comment with the corresponding question number).

YES NO 1. The response of the participants to the workshop staff was enthusiastic.

YES NO 2. During the workshop, participants discussed things they were going to do differently as a result of the workshop.

YES NO 3. In general, most of the participating teachers achieved the workshop objectives.

YES NO 4. Most of the participants participated in the workshop activities.

YES NO 5. The workshop participants responded positively to the leadership of the workshop staff.

YES NO 6. Ideas and suggestions presented to the group were immediately discussed, explored, and evaluated.

YES NO 7. The group seemed to demonstrate some ability to work out a consensus about practical applications of the workshop.

YES NO 8. Participants at the workshop seemed free to express ideas.

YES NO 9. Participants at the workshop seemed to be there for serious business.

YES NO 10. Participants at the workshop seemed to be sensitive to the needs and concerns of each other.

YES NO 11. Participants at the workshop were frank and open with each other.

YES NO 12. Participants confronted differences openly and honestly.

YES NO 13. Participants worked seriously to achieve workshop objectives.

YES NO 14. Participants utilized workshop resources successfully.

YES NO 15. Participants translated workshop objectives into specific learning strategies.

YES NO 16. Participants anticipated difficulties to be encountered at home schools while trying to implement skills and competencies newly acquired as a result of workshop objectives.

YES NO 17. Competencies newly acquired as part of workshop objectives were translated into the impact desired on eventual learner success.

YES NO 18. Participants perceived objectives, evaluations, and resources of the workshop as coordinated and interrelated.

YES NO 19. Participants and instructors had an opportunity to pinpoint the weakest spot in the workshop in order to improve future workshops.

YES NO 20. Session by session attendance by participants reflected the importance and relevance of the workshop.

YES NO 21. Participants and instructors had an opportunity to identify the strongest part of the workshop for future recycling.

OBSERVERS' EVALUATION OF PARTICIPANTS AT THE WORKSHOP

After rereading the first rough draft, the following analysis was made.

Certain items were put in the OBJ column because they refer to workshop objectives.

Certain items were put in the RES column because they refer to workshop resources.

Certain items were put in the EVAL column because they refer to workshop evaluation processes.

OBJ	RES	EVAL
3	4	1
The objectives of the workshop were vague to most participants	The resources of the workshop were seen as uninteresting or impractical by most participants	2
6		The workshop was a waste of time for most participants
8		15
9	5	16
10	8	7
11	13	
12	14	
19	18	
21	20	

EVALUATION OF

OBSERVERS' ~~EVALUATING~~ PARTICIPANTS AT THE WORKSHOP

DIRECTIONS: Circle "yes" or "no" for each of the following. (Comments may be added on the reverse side of this paper. If comments are added, please identify each comment with the corresponding question number).

YES NO 1, 3. In general, most of the participating teachers achieved the workshop objectives.

YES NO 2. The objectives of the workshop were vague to most participants

YES NO 3 6. Ideas and suggestions presented to the group were immediately discussed, explored, and evaluated.

YES NO 4 8. Participants at the workshop seemed free to ~~talk~~ express ideas, [illegible].

YES NO 5 9. Participants at the workshop seemed to be there for serious business.

YES NO 6 10. Participants at the workshop seemed to be sensitive to the needs and concerns of each other.

YES NO 7 11. Participants at the workshop were frank and open with each other.

YES NO 8 12. Participants confronted differences openly and honestly.

YES NO 9 19. Participants and instructors had an opportunity to pinpoint the weakest spot in the workshop in order to improve future workshops.

YES NO 10 21. Participants and instructors had an opportunity to identify the strongest part of the workshop for future recycling.

YES NO 14 4. Most of the participants participated in the workshop activities.

YES NO 12. The resources of the workshop were seen as uninteresting or impractical by most participants.

YES NO 13 5. The workshop participants responded positively to the leadership of the workshop staff.

YES NO 14 13. Participants worked seriously to achieve workshop objectives.

YES NO 15 14. Participants utilized workshop resources successfully.

YES NO 16 18. Participants perceived objectives, evaluations, and resources of the workshop as coordinated and interrelated.

YES NO 17 20. Session by session attendance by participants reflected the importance and relevance of the workshop.

YES NO 18 1. The response of the participants to the workshop staff was enthusiastic.

YES NO 19 2. During the workshop, participants discussed things they were going to do differently as a result of the workshop.

YES NO 20 17. Competencies newly acquired as part of workshop objectives were translated into the impact desired on eventual learner success.

YES NO 21. The workshop was a waste of time for most participants.

YES NO 22 15. Participants translated workshop objectives into specific learning strategies.

YES NO 23 16. Participants anticipated difficulties to be encountered at home schools while trying to implement skills and competencies newly acquired as a result of workshop objectives.

YES NO 24 7. The group seemed to demonstrate some ability to work out a consensus about practical applications of the workshop.

28

OBSERVERS' EVALUATION OF PARTICIPANTS AT THE WORKSHOP

ID # _____

OFFICE USE ONLY

ON = _____; NA = _____

RA = _____; NA = _____

PA = _____; NA = _____

GT = _____; NA = _____

DIRECTIONS:

A. Identify workshop, date, and activity observed.

Workshop Name _____

Date Attended _____

Activity Observed ☐ Entire Workshop

☐ Portion of Workshop:

_____(Specify)

B. Identify self by checking all descriptions that apply.

☐ BISE ☐ W.S. Director ☐ Staff ☐ SED

☐ Specialist ☐ Other: _____

OFFICE USE ONLY

ON = _____

RA = _____

PA = _____

GT = _____

C. Circle "yes" or "no" for each of the following. (Comments may be added.) Circle NA when "yes" or "no" would be inappropriate, not applicable, or not observable.

NOTE: The words, "during my observations," are assumed in all the following questions even when not repeated.

1. The objectives of the workshop (or workshop session) seemed clear to most participants during my observations.	1. NA YES NO
2. In general, most participants seemed to achieve the workshop (or workshop session) objectives during my observations.	2. NA YES NO
3. Ideas and suggestions presented to the workshop (or workshop session) group were discussed, explored, and evaluated during my observations.	3. NA YES NO
4. Participants seemed to be sensitive to the needs and concerns of each other as being worthwhile and related to workshop (or workshop session) objectives.	4. NA YES NO
5. Participants seemed to confront differences openly and objectives during the workshop (or workshop session).	5. NA YES NO
6. Participants seemed to respond positively to the leadership of the workshop (or workshop session) director.	6. NA YES NO
7. Participants seemed to respond positively to the leadership of the workshop (or workshop session) staff.	7. NA YES NO
8. Most of the participants seemed to take an active interest in the workshop (or workshop session) activities.	8. NA YES NO
9. Participants appeared comfortable professionally during the workshop (or workshop session).	9. NA YES NO
10. Participants appeared comfortable physically during the workshop (or workshop session).	10. NA YES NO

11.	The overall participant response to the workshop (or workshop session) seemed positive.	11. NA YES NO
12.	The presentation methods used seemed appropriate to the subject matter, purposes, and objectives of the workshop (or workshop session).	12. NA YES NO
13.	The presentation methods used seemed sufficient to maintain participant interest during the workshop (or workshop session).	13. NA YES NO
14.	The hardware resources demonstrated in the workshop (or workshop session) seemed to be available to most participants in their home schools.	14. NA YES NO
15.	Participants seemed to utilize to a high degree hardware resources available during the workshop (or workshop session).	15. NA YES NO
16.	Participants seemed to perceive workshop (or workshop session) objectives, evaluations, and resources as coordinated and interrelated.	16. NA YES NO
17.	Participants seemed to have an opportunity that I witnessed to pinpoint the weak spots in the workshop (or workshop session) in order to improve future workshops (or workshop sessions).	17. NA YES NO
18.	Participants seemed actually to pinpoint during my observations specific weak spots in the workshop (or workshop session) in order to improve future workshops (or workshop sessions).	18. NA YES NO
19.	Participants seemed to have during my observations an opportunity to identify the strong parts of the workshop (or workshop session) for future recycling.	19. NA YES NO
20.	Participants actually identified during my observations the strong parts of the workshop (or workshop session) for future recycling.	20. NA YES NO
21.	During the workshop (or workshop session), participants discussed things they were going to do differently as a result of the workshop (or workshop session).	21. NA YES NO
22.	During the workshop (or workshop session), participants planned things they were going to do differently as a result of the workshop (or workshop session).	22. NA YES NO
23.	Participants seemed to translate workshop (or workshop session) objectives into specific learning strategies.	23. NA YES NO
24.	Participants anticipated difficulties to be encountered at home schools while trying to implement skills and competencies newly acquired as a result of workshop (or workshop session) objectives.	24. NA YES NO
25.	I had enough observation time to form a valid impression of the quality of this workshop (or workshop session).	25. NA YES NO
26.	On the whole, this workshop (or workshop session) was of better than average quality as far as practical classroom applications are concerned.	26. NA YES NO

OBSERVERS' EVALUATION OF PARTICIPANTS AT THE WORKSHOP ID # _____

DIRECTIONS:

A. Identify workshop, date, and activity observed.

Workshop Name _____

Date Attended _____

Activity Observed ☐ Entire Workshop

☐ Portion of Workshop:

_____(Specify)

OFFICE USE ONLY

ON = _____; NA = _____

RA = _____; NA = _____

PA = _____; NA = _____

GT = _____; NA = _____

B. Identify self by checking all descriptions that apply.

☐ BISE ☐ W.S. Director ☐ Staff ☐ SED

☐ Specialist ☐ Other: _____

OFFICE USE ONLY

ON = ____%

RA = ____%

PA = ____%

GT = ____%

C. Circle "yes" or "no" for each of the following. (Comments may be added.) Circle NA when "yes" or "no" would be inappropriate, not applicable, or not observable.

NOTE: The words, "during my observations," are assumed in all the following questions even when not repeated.

1. The objectives of the workshop (or workshop session) seemed clear to most participants during my observations. 1. NA YES NO

2. In general, most participants seemed to achieve the workshop (or workshop session) objectives during my observations. 2. NA YES NO

3. Ideas and suggestions presented to the workshop (or workshop session) group were discussed, explored, and evaluated during my observations. 3. NA YES NO

4. Participants seemed to be sensitive to the needs and concerns of each other as being worthwhile and related to workshop (or workshop session) objectives. 4. NA YES NO

5. Participants seemed to confront differences openly and objectives during the workshop (or workshop session). 5. NA YES NO

6. Participants seemed to respond positively to the leadership of the workshop (or workshop session) director. 6. NA YES NO

7. Participants seemed to respond positively to the leadership of the workshop (or workshop session) staff. 7. NA YES NO

8. Most of the participants seemed to take an active interest in the workshop (or workshop session) activities. 8. NA YES NO

9. Participants appeared comfortable professionally during the workshop (or workshop session). 9. NA YES NO

10. Participants appeared comfortable physically during the workshop (or workshop session). 10. NA YES NO

11.	The overall participant response to the workshop (or workshop session) seemed positive.	11. NA YES NO
12.	The presentation methods used seemed appropriate to the subject matter, purposes, and objectives of the workshop (or workshop session).	12. NA YES NO
13.	The presentation methods used seemed sufficient to maintain participant interest during the workshop (or workshop session).	13. NA YES NO
14.	The hardware resources demonstrated in the workshop (or workshop session) seemed to be available to most participants in their home schools.	14. NA YES NO
15.	Participants seemed to utilize to a high degree hardware resources available during the workshop (or workshop session).	15. NA YES NO
16.	Participants seemed to perceive workshop (or workshop session) objectives, evaluations, and resources as coordinated and interrelated.	16. NA YES NO
17.	Participants seemed to have an opportunity that I witnessed to pinpoint the weak spots in the workshop (or workshop session) in order to improve future workshops (or workshop sessions).	17. NA YES NO
18.	Participants seemed actually to pinpoint during my observations specific weak spots in the workshop (or workshop session) in order to improve future workshops (or workshop sessions).	18. NA YES NO
19.	Participants seemed to have during my observations an opportunity to identify the strong parts of the workshop (or workshop session) for future recycling.	19. NA YES NO
20.	Participants actually identified during my observations the strong parts of the workshop (or workshop session) for future recycling.	20. NA YES NO
21.	During the workshop (or workshop session), participants <u>discussed</u> things they were going to do differently as a result of the workshop (or workshop session).	21. NA YES NO
22.	During the workshop (or workshop session), participants <u>planned</u> things they were going to do differently as a result of the workshop (or workshop session).	22. NA YES NO
23.	Participants seemed to translate workshop (or workshop session) objectives into specific learning strategies.	23. NA YES NO
24.	Participants anticipated difficulties to be encountered at home schools while trying to implement skills and competencies newly acquired as a result of workshop (or workshop session) objectives.	24. NA YES NO
25.	I had enough observation time to form a valid impression of the quality of this workshop (or workshop session).	25. NA YES NO
26.	On the whole, this workshop (or workshop session) was of better than average quality as far as practical classroom applications are concerned.	26. NA YES NO

TALLY DIRECTIONS
FOR FORMS ENTITLED
OBSERVERS' EVALUATION OF TEACHER INSERVICE WORKSHOPS

STEP 1: COMPUTE ON, RA, PA, and GT together with the associated NA score for each form.

and

Place these scores in the appropriate spaces in the OFFICE USE area.

NOTE: To compute ON, RA, and PA, count one point for each YES circled.

To compute the associated NA score, count one point for each NA circled.

ON = the count for questions 1-9
RA = the count for questions 6-20
PA = the count for questions 16-26
GT = ON + RA + PA

NOTE: It is to be noted that several of the questions are counted in more than one score because of content overlap.

STEP 2: COMPUTE the ON, RA, PA, and GT percentages of success with the following formulae by using the tables on pages 6-7.

and

Place these percentages in the appropriate spaces in the OFFICE USE area (p.3) on each form for eventual use on the profile form (p.10).

Formulae	Sample Scores	Sample Calculation
ON % = $\frac{ON}{9 - NA}$	ON = 8 NA = 0	ON % = $\frac{8}{9-0} = \frac{8}{9}$ = 89%
RA % = $\frac{RA}{15 - NA}$	RA = 11 NA = 4	RA % = $\frac{11}{15 - 4} = \frac{11}{11}$ = 100%
PA % = $\frac{PA}{11 - NA}$	PA = 7 NA = 3	PA % = $\frac{7}{11 - 3} = \frac{7}{8}$ = 88%
GT % = $\frac{ON + RA + PA}{35 - NA - NA - NA}$	Use above scores	GT % = $\frac{8 + 11 + 7}{35 + 0 - 4 - 3}$ GT % = $\frac{26}{28}$ = 93%

ID # ____

OFFICE USE ONLY

ON = ____

RA = ____

PA = ____

GT = ____

OBSERVERS' EVALUATION OF PARTICIPANTS AT THE WORKSHOP

DIRECTIONS: A. Identify workshop, date, and activity observed.

Workshop Name _____

Date Attended _____

Activity Observed _____

B. Identify self by checking all descriptions that apply.

☐ BISE ☐ W.S. Director ☐ Staff ☐ SED

☐ Specialist ☐ Other: _____

C. Circle "yes" or "no" for each of the following. (Comments may be added.) Circle NA when "yes" or "no" would be inappropriate, not applicable, or not observable.

1. The objectives of the workshop seemed clear to most participants during my observations.	1. NA	YES	NO
2. In general, most participants seemed to achieve the workshop objectives during my observations.	2. NA	YES	NO
3. Ideas and suggestions presented to the group were discussed, explored, and evaluated during my observations.	3. NA	YES	NO
4. Participants seemed to be sensitive to the needs that concern each other as being worthwhile and related to workshop objectives.	4. NA	YES	NO
5. Participants seemed to confront differences openly and objectively.	5. NA	YES	NO
6. Participants seemed to respond positively to the leadership of the workshop director.	6. NA	YES	NO
7. Participants seemed to respond positively to the leadership of the workshop staff.	7. NA	YES	NO
8. Most of the participants seemed to take an active interest in the workshop activities.	8. NA	YES	NO
9. Participants appeared comfortable professionally.	9. NA	YES	NO
10. Participants appeared comfortable physically.	10. NA	YES	NO

11.	The overall participant response to the workshop seemed positive.	11.	NA	YES NO
12.	The presentation methods used seemed appropriate to the subject matter, purposes, and objectives of the workshop.	12.	NA	YES NO
13.	The presentation methods used seemed sufficient to maintain participant interest.	13.	NA	YES NO
14.	The hardware resources demonstrated in the workshop seemed to be available to most participants in their home schools.	14.	NA	YES NO
15.	Participants seemed to utilize hardware resources available during the workshop to a high degree.	15.	NA	YES NO
16.	Participants seemed to perceive workshop objectives, evaluations, and resources as coordinated and interrelated.	16.	NA	YES NO
17.	Participants seemed to have an opportunity that I witnessed to pinpoint the weak spots in the workshop in order to improve future workshops.	17.	NA	YES NO
18.	Participants seemed to actually pinpoint during my observations specific weak spots in the workshop in order to improve future workshops.	18.	NA	YES NO
19.	Participants seemed to have during my observations an opportunity to identify the strong parts of the workshop for future recycling.	19.	NA	YES NO
20.	Participants actually identified during my observations the strong parts of the workshop for future recycling.	20.	NA	YES NO
21.	During the workshop, participants <u>discussed</u> things they were going to do differently as a result of the workshop.	21.	NA	YES NO
22.	During the workshop, participants <u>planned</u> things they were going to do differently as a result of the workshop.	22.	NA	YES NO
23.	Participants seemed to translate workshop objectives into specific learning strategies.	23.	NA	YES NO
24.	Participants anticipated difficulties to be encountered at home schools while trying to implement skills and competencies newly acquired as a result of workshop objectives.	24.	NA	YES NO
25.	I had enough observation time to form a valid impression of the quality of this workshop.	25.	NA	YES NO
26.	On the whole, this workshop was of better than average quality as far as practical classroom applications are concerned.	26.	NA	YES NO

OBSERVERS EVALUATION OF PARTICIPANTS AT THE WORKSHOP

Potential Application Guide

PURPOSE

The purpose of this guide is to show typical workshop recommendations that can be given any time a specific evaluation item is responded to unfavorably by evaluators.

The left hand column entitled EVALUATION ITEM is paralleled by the right hand column entitled APPROPRIATE REACTION TO NEGATIVE EVALUATION.

The digits preceding the hyphen in the following examples help link appropriate activities to the correlated evaluation items. Thus, reactions 1-1, 1-2, 1-3, and so forth are related to evaluation item 1-0.

EVALUATION ITEM	APPROPRIATE REACTION TO NEGATIVE EVALUATION
1-0 The objectives of the workshop seemed clear to most participants during my observations.	1-1 Write out the objectives. 1-2 Clarify any objectives that need further explanation. 1-3 Provide examples of the workshop objective. 1-4 Ascertain participant reaction to the workshop objectives. 1-5 Pinpoint what in the objectives seem to be vague, unclear, misleading, or confusing.
2-0 In general, most participants seemed to achieve the workshop objectives during my observations.	2-1 Specify the percentage of participants who did not achieve workshop objective. 2-2 Identify, when possible, the participants who did not achieve workshop objectives. 2-3 Try to find out why the workshop objectives were not achieved. 2-4 Package supplementary materials that can help non-achiever participants achieve workshop objectives at a later date. 2-5 Provide concrete examples of how achiever participants have used workshop objectives to become better educators.
3-0 Ideas and suggestions presented to the group were discussed, explored, and evaluated during my observations.	3-1 List the ideas and suggestions presented to the group. 3-2 List how the ideas and suggestions were discussed. 3-3 List how the ideas and suggestions were explored. 3-4 List how the ideas and suggestions were evaluated. 3-5 List practical ways ideas and suggestions could have been discussed, explored, and evaluated more fully.

EVALUATION ITEM	APPROPRIATE REACTION TO NEGATIVE EVALUATION
4-0 Participants seemed to be sensitive to the needs that concern each other as being worthwhile and related to workshop objectives.	4-1 Provide a list of observable ways individuals can be sensitive to one another. 4-2 Provide a list showing how human sensitivity to one another can be directly correlated to workshop success. 4-3 Provide a list of a half dozen things to do that will increase the workshop sensitivity. 4-4 Provide a list of a number of things that should be avoided to increase workshop sensitivity. 4-5 Give specific examples of how workshop sensitivity has helped individuals grow into better educators.
5-0 Participants seemed to confront differences openly and objectively.	5-1 Provide a list of differences of opinion that can be expected given this specific workshop situation. 5-2 Check off on the above list those specific differences that did emerge. 5-3 Identify those specific differences that emerged and were confronted openly. 5-4 Suggest ways that other differences can be confronted and resolved. 5-5 Specify the most important difference confronted and resolved at the workshop.
6-0 Participants seemed to respond positively to the leadership of the workshop director.	6-1 Summarize in a few words the main leadership thrust of the workshop director. 6-2 Pinpoint specific things the workshop director did to achieve this leadership thrus 6-3 Identify the most successful things the workshop leader did to assert leadership. 6-4 Identify the most unsuccessful things the workshop leader did to assume leadership. 6-5 Explain in a few words how the workshop director perceives the difference between leadership and direct control.
7-0 Participants seemed to respond positively to the leadership of the workshop staff.	7-1 Summarize in a few words the main leadership thrust of the workshop staff. 7-2 Pinpoint specific things the workshop staff did to achieve this leadership thrust. 7-3 Identify the most successful things the workshop staff did to assert leadership. 7-4 Identify the most unsuccessful things the workshop staff did to assume leadership. 7-5 Explain in a few words how the workshop staff perceives the difference between leadership and direct control.

EVALUATION ITEM	APPROPRIATE REACTION TO NEGATIVE EVALUATION
8-0 Most of the participants seemed to take an active interest in the workshop activities.	8-1 List some of the workshop activities that should have actively involved workshop participants.
	8-2 Specify those workshop activities which actually did arouse an active interest in workshop participants.
	8-3 Specify those workshop activities which did not arouse an active interest in workshop participants.
	8-4 Develop at least one new activity that seems to offer a greater likelihood of participant interest.
	8-5 Specify the most successful activities as far as exciting active interest in participants was concerned.
9-0 Participants appeared comfortable professionally	9-1 List some of the things that were done before the conference to make the participants comfortable professionally.
	9-2 List things that were done during the conference to make participants comfortabl professionally.
	9-3 List things that occurred accidentally during the conference that rendered the participants uncomfortable professionally.
	9-4 List things that were not done but that could have been done to render the partici pants more comfortable professionally.
	9-5 List several things that render you comfortable professionally whenever you atten a workshop run by somebody else.
10-0 Participants appeared comfortable physically	10-1 List some of the things that were done before the conference to make the partici-pants comfortable physically.
	10-2 List things that were done during the conference to make participants comfortabl physically.
	10-3 List things that occurred accidentally during the conference that rendered the participants uncomfortable physically.
	10-4 List things that were not done but that could have been done to render the partici pants more comfortable physically.
	10-5 List several things that render you comfortable physically whenever you attend a workshop run by somebody else.

EVALUATION ITEM		APPROPRIATE REACTION TO NEGATIVE EVALUATION	
11-0	The overall participant response to the workshop seemed positive.	11-1	List types of participant behavior that can be classified as positive response.
		11-2	List types of participant behavior that can be classified as negative response.
		11-3	List types of participant behavior that can be classified as no response at all.
		11-4	List things the workshop director can do to elicit positive participant response.
		11-5	Specify the most highly valued positive participant response as far as the workshop director is concerned.
12-0	The presentation methods used seemed appropriate to the subject matter, purposes, and objectives of the workshop.	12-1	List the presentation methods used.
		12-2	List the presentation methods deliberately not used.
		12-3	List presentation methods that would have been used had budgets been available.
		12-4	List presentation methods that would have been used had the staff been different.
		12-5	Identify the most productive presentation method used.
13-0	The presentation methods used seemed sufficient to maintain participant interest.	13-1	List the presentation methods used.
		13-2	Rank the above list according to the ability of each method to maintain participant interest.
		13-3	Develop substitute methods for those methods that seem to negate participant interest.
		13-4	Explain why for certain workshop activities only one method is used for the entire period of time.
		13-5	Explain the criteria used to recognize participant interest.
14-0	The hardware resources demonstrated in the workshop seemed to be available to most participants in their home schools.	14-1	List exactly what hardware resources were used in the workshop.
		14-2	Rank the relative effectiveness of the hardware resources utilized.
		14-3	Identify hardware resources used in the workshop that are not readily available to most participants in their home schools.
		14-4	Identify hardware resources that are definitely available to most participants in their home school.
		14-5	Adjust future presentations to take advantage of hardware resources available to most participants in their home school.

EVALUATION ITEM	APPROPRIATE REACTION TO NEGATIVE EVALUATION
15-0 Participants seemed to utilize hardware resources available during the workshop to a high degree.	15-1 List how participants used available hardware resources. 15-2 List other ways participants could have used available hardware resources. 15-3 Identify available hardware resources that seem to be unusable or usable only with great difficulty. 15-4 Pinpoint specific problems that can arise when working with available hardware resources during the workshop. 15-5 Develop a survey form to be used in order to find out which hardware resources are available to participants in their home schools.
16-0 Participants seemed to perceive workshop objectives, evaluations, and resources as coordinated and interrelated.	16-0 List on a separate piece of paper the workshop's objectives, evaluations, and resources in such a way as to show their coordination and interrelation, one with another. 16-2 Edit out of the workshop any objectives, evaluations, or resources that do not coordinate and interrelate with the other parts. 16-3 Pinpoint objectives that seem added on rather than integrated with the workshop. 16-4 Eliminate evaluation criteria, evaluation test item questions, and evaluation yardsticks that really don't relate to the objectives and activities of the workshop. 16-5 Eliminate any workshop resources, activities, sessions, or components that do not correlate with workshop objectives and evaluations.
17-0 Participants seemed to have an opportunity that I witnessed to pinpoint the weak spots in the workshop in order to improve future workshops.	17-1 List the formal opportunities participants were given to pinpoint the weak spots in the workshop. 17-2 List formal opportunities that easily could have been given to allow participants to pinpoint the weak spots in the workshop. 17-3 List the informal opportunities participants were given to pinpoint the weak spots in the workshop. 17-4 List informal opportunities that easily could have been given to allow participants to pinpoint the weak spots in the workshop. 17-5 Summarize how the workshop director feels about giving participants an opportunity to pinpoint weak spots in the workshop.

EVALUATION ITEM	APPROPRIATE REACTION TO NEGATIVE EVALUATION
18-0 Participants seemed to actually pinpoint during my observations specific weak spots in the workshop in order to improve future workshops.	18-1 Count how many participants actually did pinpoint specific weak spots in the workshop. 18-2 Count how many of the participants actually pinpointed specific weak spots in the workshop in a constructive manner in order to improve future workshops. 18-3 Count how many participants actually pinpointed specific weak spots in the workshop in a negative manner. 18-4 Identify the type of things that participants recommended should be improved in future workshops. 18-5 List those things that the workshop director intends to change in future workshops.
19-0 Participants seemed to have during my observations an opportunity to identify the strong parts of the workshop for future recycling.	19-1 List the opportunities participants actually had to identify the strong parts of the workshops. 19-2 List a number of positive reinforcement techniques that were used to draw out positive comments of workshop participants. 19-3 Identify logical places in the workshop program where participants could have been given more time to identify positive workshop components for future recycling. 19-4 Explain how the workshop director feels about allowing participants to identify positive components for future recycling. 19-5 Explain how the workshop's staff feels about allowing participants to identify positive components for future recycling.
20-0 Participants actually identified during my observations the strong parts of the workshop for future recycling.	20-1 Count how many participants actually identified strong parts of the workshop. 20-2 Estimate how many participants should have identified strong parts of the workshop. 20-3 List the strong parts identified by participants for future recycling. 20-4 Rank the strong parts identified by participants according to order of prominence. 20-5 Cite specific new ideas that occur to the workshop director as a result of the positive feedback provided by participants.

EVALUATION ITEM	APPROPRIATE REACTION TO NEGATIVE EVALUATION
21-0 During the workshop, participants <u>discussed</u> things they were going to do differently as a result of the workshop.	21-1 List the time reserved on the workshop schedule for participants to discuss things to be done differently. 21-2 List times not officially on the workshop schedule that were appropriate for participants to discuss things they were going to do differently. 21-3 Specify some of the workshop components that should have naturally lead to a discussion of things participants were going to do differently. 21-4 Identify two or three things that the workshop director would have liked to have seen discussed as practical applications of the workshop. 21-5 List some of the suggested discussion topics put forth by the workshop director that were not picked up by the group.
22-0 During the workshop, participants <u>planned</u> things they were going to do differently as a result of the workshop.	22-1 List the time reserved on the workshop schedule for participants to plan things to be done differently. 22-2 List times not officially on the workshop schedule that were appropriate for participants to plan things they were going to do differently. 22-3 Specify some of the workshop components that should have naturally lead to the planning of things participants were going to do differently. 22-4 Identify two or three things that the workshop director would have liked to have seen planned as practical applications of the workshop. 22-5 List some of the suggested planned topics put forth by the workshop director that were not picked up by the group.
23-0 Participants seemed to translate workshop objectives into specific learning strategies.	23-1 List the workshop objectives that were potentially most translatable into specific learning strategies. 23-2 Specify for each of the preceding learning objectives, a learning strategy that is appropriate. 23-3 Conceptualize criteria that distinguishes appropriate learning strategies from inappropriate learning strategies. 23-4 Summarize some of the better specific learning strategies developed by participants. 23-5 Identify learning strategies that have been identified by the workshop director but were not presented by participants.

EVALUATION ITEM	APPROPRIATE REACTION TO NEGATIVE EVALUATION
24-0 Participants anticipated difficulties to be encountered at home schools while trying to implement skills and competencies newly acquired as a result of workshop objectives.	24-1 List briefly those difficulties anticipated by the workshop director. 24-2 List briefly those difficulties anticipated by the workshop staff. 24-3 List briefly those difficulties anticipated by the participants. 24-4 Explain how certain anticipated difficulties were to be handled as a result of workshop planning. 24-5 Identify certain anticipated difficulties that seemed almost impossible to resolve during workshop planning.
25-0 I had enough observation time to form a valid impression of the quality of this workshop.	25-1 Explain why observers did not seem to have enough observation time to form a valid impression of the quality of the workshop. 25-2 Identify specific areas where observers did have enough time to form a valid impression of the quality of the workshop. 25-3 Identify successful components of the workshop recognized as successful by observers. 25-4 Identify unsuccessful components of the workshop recognized as unsuccessful by observers. 25-5 Identify components of the workshop where the opinion of the workshop director and of the observer were not identical.
26-0 On the whole, this workshop was of better than average quality as far as practical classroom applications are concerned.	26-1 List three or four criteria used to identify workshop quality. 26-2 Evaluate the workshop in terms of these criteria. 26-3 Identify the strong points of the workshop. 26-4 Identify the weak points of the workshop. 26-5 Explain the preceding opinions.

INSERVICE EVALUATION SYSTEM
(BASELINE DATA)

During the months of July and August 1975, approximately 1,500 inservice teachers will be surveyed to establish a common database.

The common database will include responses given to two forms:

FORM 1: PARTICIPANTS' EVALUATION OF INSERVICE WORKSHOPS

FORM 2: OBSERVERS' EVALUATION OF PARTICIPANTS AT WORKSHOPS

Each of these forms will be tabulated to yield the following scores:

GRAND TOTAL	(A measure of overall workshop effectiveness
ON SUBTOTAL	(A measure of effectiveness for workshop objectives and needs analysis)
RA SUBTOTAL	(A measure of effectiveness for workshop resources and activities)
PA SUBTOTAL	(A measure of effectiveness for workshop's practical applications)

As a practical example of the usefulness of these totals and subtotals, the following case may be considered:

> The workshop evaluation indicates a remarkable degree of success as measured by GRAND TOTAL.
>
> An analysis of subtotals reveals high scores in ON and PA when compared to RA.

The following hypothesis is developed to analysis this situation:

> The objectives were significant enough to achieve a remarkable degree of practical applications in spite of the relative ineffectiveness of the resources utilized.

The next time around, the objectives are kept constant while the resources are made more appropriate. The result should be a higher evaluation outcome.

This type of an inservice evaluation system is at present quite rudimentary. However, the model used above does provide at least a minimum feedback loop that can result in improved effectiveness as measured by participants evaluating the workshop and by observers evaluating the participants.

As a result of analyses, a data-based decision can be made to refund the workshop next year PROVIDED that more effective resources and activities are used.

TABULATING WORKSHOP EVALUATION FORMS
(PRE-COUNT ANALYSIS)

Before tallying the count of YES and NO, each evaluation form was examined for accuracy for an overall impression of comments made by evaluating teachers.

In cases where the teacher circled YES but made comments that were obviously of a NO nature, the response was changed to reflect the comment. This was felt necessary in order to achieve objectivity.

In cases where both YES and NO were circled, only one of the responses was counted. This choice of the response to be counted was made on the basis of the comments. When no comments were available, multiple responses, blank responses, and undecided responses (for example, question marks) were tabulated as NO.

After each set of evaluation forms was tabulated, the comments were listed question by question in order to provide an overview. Each comment listed was preceded by YES or NO in order to indicate the response circled by the evaluating teacher.

The number of "blank," "undecided," and "multiple, that is YES-NO" responses was indicated for each question in the COMMENTS section.

This PRE-COUNT ANALYSIS is necessary to prevent statistical errors that might enter into the percentages due to the contamination of blank, undecided, and multiple responses.

In addition, such a PRE-COUNT ANALYSIS is beneficial to both the evaluator and to the workshop being evaluated:

The EVALUATOR can spot questions that seem difficult to answer as presented in the evaluation form. These questions should be revised in the next edition of the evaluation form.

The WORKSHOP BEING EVALUATED should make note of comments that are repeated by a significant number of independent evaluators. These comments point up significant achievements of the workshop as well as indicate practical directions for future improvement.

PRE-TALLYING INSPECTION

OF EVALUATION FORMS

STEP 1:

Each form was inspected for completeness of response.

Forms on which more than one-third of the questions were left blank were rejected and not tabulated.

STEP 2:

Forms on which two or three questions were left blank were so noted in the commentary section. In the count section, the blank was changed to reflect the majority, whether positive or negative, of the other questions on this same form. In determining whether to circle YES or NO, the general tendency of the comments was also considered.

STEP 3:

Forms which had two or three questions that were circled both YES and NO were similarily treated. In other words, the overall tendency of the form together with the comments was considered in deciding whether to count YES or NO. In all cases, the original condition of the form was noted in the commentary section.

STEP 4:

Forms that had two or three questions were marked with a question mark were similarily treated. This was noted in the commentary section as undecided.

After the above four steps, evaluation forms required the above changes in more than six items are disqualified for the final count.

In the comments section, the total number of questionnaires is qualified for being blank and the total number of questionnaires is qualified for the above reasons is noted.

The above distinction made between COUNT and COMMENTARY sections are necessary to prevent statistical errors due to percentage despairities arising from blanks, undecideds, and multiple responses.

GENERAL INTRODUCTION TO PACKETS 1 AND 2

(Summer 75 Version)

Purpose:

Packets 1 and 2 are designed to help workshop directors evaluate teacher inservice workshops with the use of participant evaluation forms.

Statement of Problem:

There are at least two ways to add up the results of any evaluation form:

1. Add up the results of each individual question.
2. Add up some type of a total score.

When each individual question is considered separately, the workshop director can make the error of an overly fine microscopic analysis which does not give the big picture.

When the workshop director confines the analysis to the grand total score, a number of workshop variables can balance out to an average score that does not reveal strong and weak points which can neutralize each other.

Methodology:

Recently, a 29 question evaluation form was developed for participants' evaluation of teacher inservice workshops.

Each question on the instrument provides for either a favorable or an unfavorable evaluation of a specific workshop component. A favorable evaluation response means that the workshop component being evaluated is rated successful. An unfavorable evaluation response means that the workshop component in question is rated unsuccessful.

Everytime this evaluation instrument is used, a simple procedure can be employed to determine the overall success percentage. To obtain this overall success percentage, the workshop evaluator divides the total number of favorable responses by the total number of possible responses.

For example, in a workshop of 100 teachers, let us suppose that the actual total number of successful responses is 1,450. Since each of the 100 evaluators had a chance to respond favorably or unfavorably to 29 questions, the total number of possible responses is 2,900.

Dividing 1,450 favorable responses by 2,900 responses gives a success percentage of 50 percent.

The above procedures provide a tabulation of the percentage of success for the workshop as measured by a specific instrument. In order to interpret what percentage score means, further statistical analysis is required.

Statistical Analysis:

A analysis of the DATA TABLE found on page 6 is made in the following pages.

Line 1 of the DATA TABLE identifies each of six workshops by a specific ID number.

Line 2 identifies the percentage of success as measured by favorable responses. This grand total (GT) is the result of questions 1-29.

Looking at the data contained in lines 1 and 2 reveals a maximum success percentage of 95 percent and a minimum success percentage of 88 percent.

Statistical analysis asks the question, "Is this 7 percentage point difference between the maximum registered success and the minimum registered success significant?"

In order to answer this question statistically, the following must be considered: the percentages being compared and the number of subjects on which these percentages are based. Changing either one of these variables will directly affect the statistical significance of the difference between the percentages.

In order to simplify the statistics involved, the following safe rules of thumb are given in order to avoid misinterpreting an insignificant difference as being significant.

Operational Procedures:

In order to distinguish between statistically significant and insignificant percentage differences, the following safe rules of thumb have been applied in analyzing the six workshop evaluations summarized in the DATA TABLE on page 6.

Rule 1: For groups larger than 150 subjects, a five percent difference is considered significant.

Rule 2: For groups of approximately 50 subjects, a 10 percent difference is considered significant.

Rule 3: For groups of less than 40 subjects, a 15 percent difference is considered significant.

Design:

With the above information in mind, the following evaluation design is suggested:

STEP 1. For each workshop being evaluated, develop a grand total (GT) percentage of success.

STEP 2. When more than one workshop is being evaluated, compare the GT scores by the preceding rules of thumb for determining statistically significant differences.

STEP 3. Whenever one or more workshops have GT percentages of success that are statistically indistinguishable as far as significant difference is concerned, go on to step 4.

STEP 4. Develop subscores that are to be analyzed as follows:

Questions 1 - 7 constitute subscore ON (Objectives and Needs Analysis).

Questions 8 - 20 constitute subscore RA (Resources and Activities).

Questions 20 - 29 constitute subscore PA (Practical Applications).

STEP 5. Present the above data in a format similar to the DATA TABLE found on page 6.

STEP 6. Perform a column analysis by analyzing each subscore of each workshop in order to find a subscore that is statistically different from the other subscores. In this analysis, attention should be given to the following format:

Line 1 identifies the workshop number.

Line 2 identifies GT percentages.

Line 3 identifies ON subscore percentages.

Line 4 identifies RA subscore percentages.

Line 5 identifies PA subscore percentages.

Line 6 identifies the number (N) of participants filling out evaluation forms.

Line 7 (to be filled in) identifies the component needing improvement.

A Specific Analysis of the Evaluations of Workshop Numbers 1 - 6:

The following analysis is based upon the DATA TABLE found on page X.

For workshop #1, the ON subscore is significantly different from the RA and PA subscores. This would indicate that future improvements should concentrate on workshop components covered by the ON questions (1-7).

For workshop #2, there is no statistical difference between the three subscores. The conclusion here is to expand the analysis to each individual question with the hope of isolating one or two items that can be improved.

For workshop #3, the RA subscore is significantly lower than the PA subscore. This means that the items evaluated by questions 8-20 should be examined to come up with possible improvements for the workshop if it is repeated.

For workshop #4, the ON subscore is lower than the RA or PA subscore. However, the difference is not significant. This would suggest further expanding the analysis to individual questions of ON in order to find significant differences.

For workshop #5, there is no statistical difference between the three subscores. The conclusion here is to expand the analysis to each individual question with the hope of isolating one or two items that can be improved.

For workshop #6, there is a 7 point difference between the ON and PA subscore when compared to RA. However, this difference is not significant. Thus, analysis should be made of individual items in order to find significant differences.

DATA TABLE

Line 1		WS #1	WS #2	WS #3	WS #4	WS #5	WS #6
Line 2	GT % (qns. 1-29)	88%	91%	90%	93%	95%	92%
Line 3	ON % (qns. 1 -7)	77	89	94	85	93	89
Line 4	RA % (qns. 8-20)	92	92	82	96	95	96
Line 5	PA % (qns. 20-29)	91	93	99	94	95	89
Line 6	Number of Evaluators	47	21	9	21	19	4
Line 7	Component Needing Improvement	ON	(?)	RA	(ON)	(?)	(ON RA)

NOTE 1: In the above DATA TABLE, parentheses around components in line 7 indicate a measurable difference between components that is not statistically significant even though it might represent a magnitude of from 7 to 11 percentage points. In other words, the statistical significance of the percentage difference is related both to the magnitude of the difference and to the number (N) of evaluators as explained in the safe rules of thumb found on page 3.

NOTE 2: In addition to the analysis performed on vertical columns, it is possible to perform an analysis based upon horizontal rows. For example:

In line 2, workshop #5 has the highest percentage. However, this difference is not significant.

In line 3, workshop #3 has the highest percentage. However, this difference is significant only in comparison to WS #1.

In line 4, workshop #4 and #6 have the highest percentages. However, this difference is significant only in comparison with WS #3.
H

In line 5, workshop #3 has the highest percentage. However, this difference is not significant.

NOTE 3: In addition to developing a vertical column analysis and horizontal row analysis line by line, it is possible to simultaneously develop a row and column analysis.

For example, workshop #3 is simultaneously the lowest in line 4, that is, RA (resource and activity subscore) and the highest in line 5, that is PA (practical application subscore).

In the above notes, examples have been given of how the DATA TABLE can be used to develop a narrative evaluation of the inservice workshop.

EVALUATION REPORT

WORKSHOP IDENTIFICATION DATA

A. Form Used: PARTICIPANTS' EVALUATION OF INSERVICE TEACHER WORKSHOP

B. Name of Workshop: _____

C. Dates of Workshop: _____

D. Number of participants evaluating workshop: _____

E. Number of participants attending workshop: _____

F. Percent of participants evaluating workshop: _____ %

WORKSHOP EVALUATION DATA

GT = Grand Total (Qns. 1-29)
ON = Objectives and Needs Analysis Subtotal (Qns. 1-7)
RA = Resources and Activities Subtotal (Qns. 8-20)
PA = Practical Applications Subtotal (Qns. 21-29)

G. Percentage of Success

GT Success	ON Success	RA Success	PA Success
%	%	%	%

H. Ranking of Success

The numbers circled below indicates the rank of the above percentages. "1st" is the highest rank; "3rd" is the lowest rank.

ON Success	RA Success	PA Success
1st	1st	1st
2nd	2nd	2nd
3rd	3rd	3rd

I. Analysis

1. The highest percentage identifies the most successful component of the workshop.

2. The lowest percentage identifies the workshop components most in need of improvement.

The attached materials include a one page evaluation report, a packet of completed forms that can be used by the workshop director to develop a narrative evaluation summary, and a few brief observations on the above evaluation report and completed forms.

I. The evaluation report does the following:

Lines A-F: Identify the workshop being evaluated.

Line G: Summarizes the tabulation of the form entitled Participants' Evaluation of Teacher Inservice Workshops by presenting the percentages of success for the entire evaluation (grand total) and for significant clusters (subscores) of questions.

To distinguish between statistically significant and insignificant percentage differences, the following safe rules of thumb should be applied:

Rule 1: For groups of more than 150 subjects, a 5% difference is considered significant.

Rule 2: For groups of approximately 50 subjects, a 10% difference is considered significant.

Rule 3: For groups of less than 40 subjects, a 15% difference is considered significant.

Line H: Ranks three workshop components into first, second, and third place by ranking the percentages of success found in line G.

Line I: Analyzes the above ranking by identifying the workshop component most in need of improvement.

II. The enclosed packet of forms contains:

FORM IBIA (Item-by-Item Analysis) which helps analyze each question in each low ranked component in order to pinpoint specific workshop sub-components that need improvement.

FORM CA (Comments Analysis) which helps analyze each low ranking question in terms of comments voluntarily submitted by participant evaluators.

FORM OQ (Overview Questions) which helps overview the information collected in Forms IBIA and CA in such a way as to determine if enough data has been collected to develop a narrative evaluation summary.

NOTE: These forms have been filled out by BOER in order to illustrate possible applications. These forms could just as easily have been filled out by the workshop director.

III. The few brief observations on the workshop being evaluated:

Provide a list of possible improvements that would seem appropriate based upon lines G, H, and I as well as upon FORMS IBIA and CA.

Give the workshop director the opinions of an independent observer who makes suggestions solely on the basis of the evaluation forms tabulated and not upon direct observation of the workshop.

Correlate suggestions with specific data.